

MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES

I. INTRODUCTION

GERLING has moved this Court for Leave to File a Second Amended Answer [D.E. 52 and 54] incorrectly titled "Motion for Leave to File Second Amended Complaint (D.E. 52). FFIC respectfully files this Response. In substance, FFIC does not object to the substance of the amendment so long as FFIC is not prejudiced in pursing discovery requests currently subject to a Motion to Compel and asserts that a hearing on this matter is not necessary.

II. ARGUMENT

GERLING correctly states that pursuant to Fed.R.Civ.P. 15 (a)(2), leave to amend should be freely given "when justice so requires", that federal policy strongly favors determination of cases on their merits, and leave to amend pleadings is freely given unless the opposing party makes a showing of undue prejudice, bad faith or dilatory motive on the part of the moving party, citing to Forman v. Davis. 371 U.S. 178, 182 (1962). GERLING states it seeks this amendment in order to withdraw affirmative defenses relating to: (1) the "Damages to Your Property" Exclusion (Affirmative Defense No. 12 in D.E. 31 and 40) to which FFIC has no objection (despite GERLING's tardiness in so doing in light of the Court's Order (D.E. 30) for the parties to submit their respective Motions for Summary Judgment on or before July 3, 2008); and (2) the "Exhaustion of Policy Limits" argument, (Affirmative Defense No. 13 in D.E. 31 and 40) to which FFIC does object in the event that said withdrawal prejudices FFIC in its discovery efforts, and most particularly if the withdrawal would in any way adversely affect FFIC in pursuing its Motion to Compel (D.E. 43) rescheduled for hearing before the Magistrate Judge, Edward M. Chen on August 6, 2008 at 10:30 a.m..

As noted in the Motion to Compel (D.E. 43), FFIC seeks to compel discovery from GERLING for the production of documents relating to claims paid by GERLING, other claims

9

12

14

13

15 16

17

18

19 20

21

22 23

24

25 26

27

28

made against GENCOR INDUSTRIES, INC. ("GENCOR") the defendant-insured in the Underlying State Court Liability Action against whom FFIC has been awarded Final Judgments [as to liability/damages and costs (D.E. 29-2, 29-3)] and from which this insurance dispute arises.

Throughout the life of the underlying action and this pending case, GERLING has failed and refused to adequately respond to FFIC's requests, pursuant to F.S. § 627.4137 (c) for information relating to the available policy limits from GERLING. GERLING has maintained, as reflected in Affirmative Defense No. 13 that "FFIC's claims are barred because the aggregate limits provided by the GERLING Policy have been exhausted and therefore no coverage is available for the damages claimed." (D.E. 31 and 40).

At this late date, GERLING's request to withdraw the exhaustion affirmative defense appears rather disingenuous, as the assertions in Affirmative Defense No. 13 appear to have been "frivolous" from the onset; alternatively, the proposed withdrawal may represent an effort by GERLING to circumvent FFIC's right to the document Requests subject to FFIC's Motion to Compel. If the withdrawal of Affirmative Defense No. 13 renders moot the Motion to Compel and operates to prevent FFIC to obtain production confirming available policy limits and supporting documentation relating thereto, FFIC will be prejudiced by the withdrawal.¹

CONCLUSION

Accordingly, FFIC objects to the withdrawal of Affirmative Defense No. 13 (D.E. 31 and 40) only to the extent that such withdrawal moots or in any way compromises FFIC's right to

¹ This information and supporting documentation is necessary to FFIC in order to: (1) make an informed evaluation of the prospects for settlement, which information and support documentation GERLING is required to provide pursuant to F.S. § 627.4137; and (2) make an informed evaluation as to coverage issues based upon what claims, if any, previously asserted against GERLING's insured, Gencor, have been accepted for payment by GERLING and what claims, other than those that form the basis of this coverage dispute, have been rejected for payment GERLING.

Document 75

Filed 07/09/2008

Page 4 of 5

Case 3:07-cv-06302-CRB

27

28

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

Signature:

Plaintiff's Response to Defendant's Motion for Leave of Court to File Second Amended Complaint [Answer] [D.E. 52 and 54] [F.R.C.P. 15 (a)(2)]